



Approved Meeting Minutes

Coos Bay BLM Resource Advisory Committee Meeting

February 22, 2002

Introductions:

Sue Richardson, District Manager (DM) and Designated Federal Official (DFO), welcomed everyone and made some introductions:

Alan Hoffmeister, BLM Public Affairs Officer, introduced as key contact for issues pertaining to Committee operations;

Glenn Harkleroad, BLM Restoration Coordinator, introduced as key contact for issues about projects;

Also introduced: BLM Field Managers Elaine Raper (Umpqua Field Office) and Rich Conrad (Myrtlewood Field Office); and BLM Oregon/Washington State Office staff Maya Fuller and Jim Hallberg.

Alan led the group through the Agenda and indicated that he would facilitate as needed at the meeting.

Each Committee member and alternate present introduced themselves:

Neil Westfall - tree farmer cattle rancher,

Timm Slater - Weyerhaeuser 30 years, city politics

Mike Smith - South Coast Trail Riders -- off-road interests

Amy Ruddell - Livestock extension agent - agricultural interests

Jan Tetreault - one of the Directors of the Umpqua Soil and Water Conservation District, timber marker and cruiser

Pete DeMain- Coos County Commissioner

Glenn Thompson - Construction Business, artist, programmed computers

George Smith - Coquille Tribe forestry

Fred Green - Timber Export business

Ed Cooley - Cattle and timber, Umpqua Soil and Water Conservation District, Budget Committee of Elkton School District

Bob Kinyon - Umpqua Watershed Coordinator, 23 years in Forest Service fire management, Chair of Roseburg BLM RAC

Helen Franklin - 15 year logging consultant, intent vs. application research, involved in wild horse and burro group

Gordon Ross - Archeology and historic interest, dairy farmer

Penny Lind - Executive Director of Umpqua Watersheds, Committee Trail Volunteers president

John Griffith - Disbursed Recreation, Coos County Commissioner

Mark Villers - Blue Ridge Timber Company interests in forest, 7th summer of stream restoration projects

Alan noted that personal information about the RAC members is proprietary, and will not be sent out to the general public. Okay to share with other Committee members.

Background and History of the Act & Expectations for Accomplishments:

Doug Robertson, Chair of the Douglas County Commissioners, Chair of the Association of O&C Counties, and member of the National RAC, spoke to the Committee about the history of the legislation. He indicated that it is extremely important to all supporters of this legislation that this RAC succeed. There is a need to see cooperation of local folks with federal land management. There will be no incentive to continue funding after 2006 if this effort does not succeed. Doug described how Douglas County is approaching the use of funds from the legislation. He encourage all to work closely with county commissioners concerning disbursement of money on projects with prioritization in mind. Doug introduced Debbie Mendenhall, the key Douglas County Commissioners staff person who helped coordinate nominees to populate RACs.

Rocky McVay, Executive Director of the Association of O&C Counties, addressed the legislation and the Charter. The Charter provides basic guidance. There are three categories of land: O&C, CBWR, and National Forest Lands covered by the legislation. There are 44 states, and 6 titles in legislation, 4 that pertain to Oregon, Titles II and III are the only ones important to this group. Title II funding is reserved in US Treasury. Title III funding goes directly to the counties. The RAC will review two cycles of projects immediately, FY2002 and FY2003. Revenues for this legislation are on a continuing appropriation, which is in place right now. Committee appointments are for three years. Required to have all funding recommendations to the DFO by September 30, 2006. Sue/DFO has until 9/30/07 to make sure all money is allocated to projects. If it is not, it will be returned to the US treasury.

Rocky suggested that the Committee should plan for contingencies when thinking about projects. Projects that are off-the-shelf (i.e., ready to go) will be the first projects to be submitted. During this first couple of years expect to see some variation between projected projects costs and actual costs. By the fourth year, we will need to be able to show Congress the true costs of the projects. Title III is limited to six different categories that are very narrow. An approved project on non-federal land becomes a federal project due to the federal funding. These projects are subject to NEPA and other federal legal requirements due to the discretionary nature of the federal funding. Administrative costs and/or the cost of doing business or projects are negotiable. National Fire Plan Grant Funds: just became available; apply for that project money. We should expect Congressional oversight hearings to deal with Title II projects sometime this year; there will be requests for RAC members to go to Congress to explain how you collaborated on projects. Failure is not an option. Don't drop the potato; don't let the project progress get bogged down with some imagined policy.

Committee Charter and Member Roles and Responsibilities:

Sue Richardson addressed the Charter and the roles of RAC members, indicating that the RAC members are the keys between the communities and the Federal Agencies involved. Duties of committee are to review projects, to propose projects, identify sources of funding, and provide opportunities for others to participate. There are three categories with 5 members each, two alternates each. Three year terms.

BLM and FS RAC charters are not the same: BLM RAC charters are more specific.

Alan Hoffmeister pointed out that RAC members are appointed under FACA, the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Members are approved by the Secretary of Interior. The RAC is also subject to FOIA - Freedom of Information Act.

Glenn Harkleroad described the federal project process and time lines. See copy of his Power Point presentation in the back of the Project Notebook.

Funding Distribution:

4% RAC operational expenses, i.e. recorder, meeting locations, facilitators. If not needed or used for this, can be put toward projects.

8% Administrative Overhead, "keep the BLM door open."

88% Title II project funds, for project development, implementation, and monitoring.

Dedicated staff to full time RAC projects? Project sponsor. Possible to have the project sponsors to come to us as RAC members rather than chase them? Yes, we (BLM) will make them available as needed.

Proposed Operational Time Lines for Coos Bay BLM RAC:

2002 project review and selection by 3/7/02

Submission deadline for 2003 projects by 5/28/02

2003 project review and selection by 8/26/02

Submission deadline for 2004 projects by 5/26/03

Election of Officers: Select first and second alternate members in Category 2; decide on Officers needed; hold elections by ballot.

The RAC decided to elect a Chair and Vice Chair.

Regarding alternates,

In Category 1 is one vacant alternate: Amy will be Primary Alternate.

In Category 2, there are two alternates: Mark Villers and John Guynup: Mark was selected as the Primary Alternate, with John as second.

Category 3 has two alternates, Ed Cooley and Fred Green. Fred was elected as Primary Alternate, with Ed as second. Because Bud Hakanson, Category 3 primary member has resigned, Fred Green will replace him as a new primary RAC member.

Ballots for Chair: show of hands who would volunteer chair: Timm, Jan, Pete, Bob, John, top voter being chair and 2nd being vice. **John Griffith was elected Chair**, with a tie vote between Jan and Timm for Vice Chair. Jan conceded to Timm, so **Timm Slater is Vice Chair**. Vice Chair is to operate when only the Chair is not present. Chair is key official to approve minutes, etc.

Role of Alternate Members? Alternates help discuss but have no votes. Alternates can be reimbursed for costs. Alternates cannot vote in place of a primary. The alternates were asked to participate in meetings, provide expertise. If in the future, this does not work, then ask that the charter be amended.

Helen Franklin asked if absent members could send a proxy vote. Discussion asked, what's the incentive to show up to the meetings if you could send in your proxy? The Charter specifies that the

DFO should question a member's future on the Committee if they miss two meetings. Attendance is necessary for a quorum. Would not want proxies to become main quorum.

Projects:

After lunch, the RAC heard descriptions of proposed projects from Coos County's Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and BLM.

Material about the Coos County TAG was handed out by Paul Slater. Members of the TAG included: Tom Purvis USDA, Alan Hoffmeister. BLM, Ann Steeves, Port of Bandon, Nikki Moore NMFS, Jennifer Hampel Coquille Watershed, Mike Mauder, Tenmile Lakes Basin, John Souder, Coos Watersheds, Dave Peters, Coquille STEP, Debbie Houshour, Friends of Coquille, Carl Linderman, USDA-USFS, Pam Blake, DEQ, John Moore, Plum Creek, Howard Crombie, ODFW, Lloyd VanGordon, OWRD, Craig Tuss, USDI-USFWS, Gary Schultz, ODF, Ralph Duddles, OSU Extension Service, and Paul Slater, Coos County Government.

Paul described the TAG's purpose and decision-making process, project proposal guidelines, outline of how to review projects and elect chair. The TAG used three sets of criteria: project review Public Law: Watershed Restoration, wildlife habitat restoration, and forest health.

Glenn Harkleroad described the organization and contents of the Projects Notebook (handed out).

Since TAG only looked at projects in Coos County, what are the BLM's priorities? BLM did not choose to prioritize projects since BLM did not know how the RAC would feel about prioritization of projects. The information for projects is not entirely comparable. Would it be appropriate for BLM to prioritize externally submitted projects? TAG re-prioritized original list from BLM. RAC would like to know how BLM felt about prioritized on projects. Need more information from BLM.

RAC's job is to review and assign priorities.

Are there projects here that should be deferred until next year that are not ready to go this year?

Handout: Coos County TAG Forest Health Project Ranking Criteria
Project Criteria Questions

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

Project Review:

The RAC looks at the potential and discusses process necessary. It was stated that no facilitator would be needed for RAC meetings. There was discussion around the availability of other facilities for meetings and whether or not the meetings should be (audio) recorded. It was decided not to (audio) record meetings. Site field trips - no votes on field trips. Review of projects has already been done. Not advantageous to be out looking at sites. Perhaps have the ground crew come to meetings for review. If individual RAC members are interested, they can contact Sue, Alan, Glenn, or the project sponsor to see a field project site.

Project review criteria:

If project was not ready or nearly ready to go, they got a lower priority. At the end of the second meeting a list should be delivered to the DFO of approved projects.

Discussion on what kind of criteria the RAC would like to use for rating projects:

1. NEPA
2. Multi-year projects?
3. Are you comfortable with the technical merits of project? Suggestion: divide projects and categorize into like projects groups.
4. Go one or two steps beyond the amount of projects than there is money for.

One criteria to keep in mind for some projects: partners in projects that are already partially funded through other means/cooperators.

Rank within project type according to application/date submitted? This is probably not viable since Glenn has changed some of these dates to track edits of the submissions.

Too many questions within each project as to how ranking could take place. Too many variables.

Ability to implement project in this season.

Type, county, NEPA, partners, multi-year, technical merits, continuance of project from county to county.

No additional submissions of projects for 2002, as cut-off date has been passed. Can receive submission of projects at any time, but new submissions will not be considered for 2002 funding.

Categorize by type (watershed roads, watershed fish, and education) by county, partnership/finance, cost benefit ratio, application date-ready to go when, continuity with other projects or county, how much front-end work(NEPA, EA, etc.) vs. ground work, timing with permitting process, employment created.

Categorize projects by:

- County
- Type of project: upland projects, riparian improvement, instream, roads & trails, education

Go through criteria list and clarify each criteria.

Rework of Ranking Criteria and Clarification:

- Synergy with other related projects?
- Low cost/high benefit ratio?
- Availability of funding partners?
- Project ready to implement? NEPA, permits, design, etc.
- Potential to create employment?
- High on-the-ground to study and design costs ratio?
- Timing with OWEB funding and instream windows

Look at other criteria on TAG list?

RAC members should contact Glenn Harkleroad with any questions on the project proposals between this meeting and the next one. Glenn will get the answers and provide the information to all RAC members, so that as many questions as possible can be answered before the next meeting, so that we don't spend all the time answering questions and not approving projects.

Questions on Coos County projects should be referred to John Griffith.

Next Meeting March 7th at 9:00 a.m. at BLM office in North Bend.

The RAC discussed future meeting dates and places due to the fact the notice has to be published 30-days in advance of meeting in Federal Register.

Agreed to next meeting dates of:

May 3rd , Friday at BLM, North Bend, Conference Room A

June 20th, Thursday at BLM, North Bend, Conference Room A

Meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

Approved by: Signed by John Griffith
Committee Chair

March 7, 2003
Date

Amendment to Feb 22 meeting minutes:

Page 3 -- Funding Distribution

The money available through Title II to the Coos Bay Resource Advisory Committee this fiscal year was as follows:

Coos County -- \$508,891.53
Douglas County -- \$616,107.17
Curry County -- \$14,882.69

It was agreed by the Committee that the dollar amount from each county was not "sacred," but minor adjustments between counties could be made when allocating money to projects, if the affected county commissioners concur.

It was also understood that some funds not allocated in one year could be held over until the following year.